Claim 1, line 38 (last line) before the period insert - -and possessing gloss of 60% or below- -;

Claim 27, lines 2-3, delete "(islands) or particles in Rugby ball form";

28. The synthetic paper as claimed in claim 1, possessing opaqueness of 83% or above.

REMARKS

The claims in the application are 1-20, 27 and Claim 28 introduced by the present Amendment.

Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 27, has been amended to eliminate the formal rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 raised in paragraphs 2-5 of the Office Action. The Amendment to independent Claim 1 herein and new Claim 28 find support in the data of the working examples presented in Tables 1 and 2 of the present application.

Claims 1-20 and 27 have again been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 4,318,950 to Takashi et al., in view of European Patent No. 613919 to Ueda et al. In this regard, the examiner cites U.S. Pat. No. 5,385, 777 to Higuchi et al. as teaching that surface resistivity of a polypropylene sheet decreased when it is oriented (column 10, lines 27-32). However, it is respectively emphasized that the present invention as recited in

all claims herein is patentable over any possible combination of the cited art for the following reasons.

It is again emphasized that the present application relates to an invention of synthetic paper possessing excellent printability. As shown in the results documented in Tables 1 and 2 and accompanying examples in the present application, the synthetic paper of the present invention always possesses gloss below 60% and opaqueness at least 83%. On the other hand, the opaqueness in Comparative Example 3 (a resin composition with mechanical strength and heat resistance, but not a synthetic paper), close to the composition as disclosed in Ueda et al., was as low as 60% (translucent). Further, the resin composition in comparative Example 3 possessed surface gloss as high as 98%. Therefore, as emphasized herein and previously, the products of the present invention and Ueda et al. are quite different in structure, composition and resulting properties.

Concerning the Examiner's assertion that Ueda et al. teach that their composition may be used with filler (page 7, lines 12-14 of the Office Action), column 12, lines 11-16 of U.S. Pat. No. 5,652,326 to Ueda et al. (page 11, lines 19-22 in equivalent European Pat. No, 613,919) states the following:

> The resin composition of the invention can be added with other resin additives within the scope not interfering with the objects of the invention. Examples of the additives used are pigments, dyes, fillers, nucleating agents, glass fibers, lubricants,

plasticizers, mold lubricants, antioxidants, fire retardants, UV absorbers and surfactants [emphasis added].

However, Ueda et al. only disclose the filler as one of the general additives for resin, and do not disclose any specific examples of the filler. Furthermore, Ueda et al. disclose that a surfactant is the preferred additive to the resin. The amount of surfactant is then disclosed, at column 12, lines 18-21 (page 11, lines 23-24) usually from 0.01 to 5%, preferably from 0.05 to 3% based on the total weight of polyetheresteramide and metal halides. This amount is much smaller than the claimed amount of fine inorganic particles as an essential component of the present invention; the amount of fine inorganic particles in the present invention is from 10 to 250 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of resin components. Accordingly, the surface properties, namely offset printing property, of the present invention cannot at all be suggested by the teachings in Ueda et al. Therefore, contrary to the assertion at the top of page 7 in the Office Action, Ueda et al. clearly do not teach the same composition as what is claimed. In this regard, it is again pointed out that Ueda et al. fail to show a stretched film possessing the structure recited in the claims.

Concerning the Examiner's assertion about Higuchi et al. on page 7 of the Office Action, it is respectfully pointed out that Higuchi et al. relate to a porous film used as a battery separator, not synthetic paper. A composition comprising polypropylene and polyethylene was molded from, e.g., an extruder, with the resulting film being subjected to annealing, then stretching at low temperature (25°C) to a ratio of 200% and then, in the same

direction at 95°C, to a ratio of 200% (col. 12, lines 38-44). The thus-obtained film is then observed under a scanning electron microscope (SEM).

It is described, at column 8, lines 31-37 of Higuchi et al. that

> The surface observation with SEM reveals that there does exist a number of lamellae (crystals) aligned in the direction substantially perpendicular to the take-off direction and number of fine fibers (fibrils) parallel to the take-off direction which connect neighboring lamellae to form fine pores between the fibers.

Thus, Higuchi et al. disclose a porous film having a structure with slits being formed among the fibrillar polymers being penetrated along the direction perpendicular to the take-off direction so that the electrolytic solution of the battery can freely pass through the slits. The fine inorganic particles for use in the present invention, which may be an impurity of the electrolytic solution, are not added to the film of Higuchi et al. Accordingly, Higuchi et al is quite different from the constitution and objectives of the present invention.

Furthermore, the position that Higuchi et al. teach surface resistivity of a polypropylene sheet decreasing when oriented (column 10, lines 27-32), is incorrect; Higuchi et al do not measure the surface resistivity. According to the method of measuring electric resistance that is disclosed at column 11, lines 61-column 12, line 13 of Higuchi et al., the electrical resistance is measured by soaking a porous film in the electrolytic solution and then applying alternating current thereto, to obtain the resistivity of the film per sectional area thereof. Thus, the resistivity of Higuchi et al. is quite different from the surface resistivity in

the present invention. More particularly, the resistivity of Higuchi et al relates to freely passing ions in the electrolytic solution through the penetrated pores of the film. Accordingly, the larger the size of the pore and the number of pores, the lower the resistivity. Therefore, Higuchi et al. neither describe nor suggest that when a film is stretched according to the present invention, the film containing a molecular weight antistatic agent becomes oriented in the stretching direction and at the same time the surface resistivity of the film decreases.

Regarding the assertion on page 8 of the Office Action that surface orientation of the antistatic agent increased by incorporating polyamide (and not by orienting and oxidizing the surface), attention is respectfully called to Comparative Examples 2 and 3 of the present application, where the identical composition was subjected to stretching (Comparative Examples 2) and no stretching (Comparative Examples 3). Surface resistivity of resulting films still varied by 10^3 times by stretching. In other words, orienting the antistatic agent along the surface by adding the polyamide to the composition may be one factor, but remarkably improving surface resistivity by stretching is quite another factor that has been incorporated in the present invention in combination with all the other features, ingredients, structures, etc. Thus, decrease in surface resistivity by stretching and orienting is not at all suggested by Ueda et al.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing Amendment, accompanying remarks, and previously-submitted Declaration by the inventor in the above-identified application, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending herein are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, then it is respectfully requested that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the earliest convenience to discuss the present application.

The fee for the additional claim introduced herein is enclosed.

Early, favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DILWORTH & BARRESE

Rocco S. Barrese
Reg. No. 25,253
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, NY 11553
(516) 228-8484
RSB/GMK/jkv